EAS	TED STATES DISTRICT COURT FERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
	TED STATES OF AMERICA,	
	-against-	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER 03-CR-01120 (FB)
VIRC	GIL RIVERS,	03 CR 01120 (1 <i>B</i>)
	Defendant.	
For the LORD Unite DAV Unite Crimic 271 C	arances: he Government: ETTA E. LYNCH, ESQ. ed States Attorney TD CAREY WOLL, ESQ. ed States Attorneys Office inal Division Cadman Plaza East klyn, NY 11201	For the Defendant: VIRGIL RIVERS, pro se #81378-158 Unit: DA P.O. Box 26032 Beaumont, TX 77720
BLO	CK, Senior District Judge:	
	Virgil Rivers ("Rivers") moves, pro se, to dismiss the indictment upon which	
he was convicted and sentenced. He argues that, because the first page of the		
super	superceding indictment contained an error—by listing the wrong section of the United	
States	States Code on the first page, but not the second—the entire indictment was defective	
and d	and deprived the Court of subject matter jurisdiction.	
	Ι	
An indictment must "be a plain, concise, and definite written statement of the		
essen	tial facts constituting the offense charge	ed." FED. R. CRIM. P. (7)(c)(1). The rule

fairly informs a defendant of the charge against which he must defend." *Hamling v. United States*, 418 U.S. 87, 117 (1974). An error in the citation of law that the

is satisfied so long as the indictment "contains the elements of the offense charged and

defendant is alleged to have violated is not a ground to dismiss an indictment or

reverse a conviction "[u]nless the defendant was misled and thereby prejudiced."

FED. R. CRIM. P. 7(c)(2).

The most recent Second Circuit authority that addresses this uncommon argument is nearly 40 years old, and holds that, "if an indictment properly charges an offense, it is sufficient, even though an inapposite statute is referred to therein." *United States v. Eucker*, 532 F.2d 249, 257 (2d Cir. 1976); *see also United States v. Calabro*, 467 F.2d 973, 981 (2d Cir. 1972) ("The fact that the wrong section of the statute was cited does not invalidate either the charge . . . if, as here, no prejudice is shown to derive from the miscitation.").

The Seventh Circuit has a less dated opinion that considered a similar issue. In *United States v. Bjorkman*, 270 F.3d 482 (7th Cir. 2001), the court relied on *Neder v. United States*, 527 U.S. 1 (1999), which held that a conviction may be affirmed under harmless-error analysis if an indictment omitted a harmless element of the crime charged. *See Neder*, 527 U.S. at 15. Building on *Neder*, the *Bjorkman* court reasoned that just as "deficiencies that make a [civil] complaint dismissable under FED. R. CIV.

1	P. 12(b)(6) do not deprive a court of jurisdiction unless the complaint is frivolous,	
2	so errors in a non-frivolous indictment do not strip the district court of jurisdiction	
3	under [18 U.S.C.] §3231." 270 F.3d at 490. Thus, "district judges always have	
4	subject-matter jurisdiction based on any indictment purporting to charge a violation	
5	of federal criminal law." <i>Id.</i> (emphasis in original).	
6	Under Eucker and Calabro, and the persuasive reasoning of Bjorkman, the error	
7	on page one of Rivers's indictment did not deprive the Court of subject matter	
8	jurisdiction. Properly assessed, the non-frivolous indictment contained a typographical	
9	error that was corrected on its second page, and it included specific overt acts that	
10	Rivers took in furtherance of the conspiracy to commit bank robbery. See Mem. &	
11	Order, United States v. Virgil Rivers, Dkt. No. 245, May 19, 2010. Accordingly, there	
12	is no merit to Rivers's claim that he was "misled and thereby prejudiced" by the error	
13	FED. R. CRIM. P. 7(c)(2).	
14	II	
15	For the reasons stated above, Rivers's motion is DENIED .	
16	SO ORDERED.	
17	/S/ Frederic Block	
18	FREDERIC BLOCK	
19	Senior United States District Judge	
20	Brooklyn, New York	
21	July 30, 2014	